Document electronically

generated from the

United Nations

Optical Disk System

1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

NPT/CONF.1995/MC.II/SR.8
12 May 1995
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

MAIN COMMITTEE II

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 8th MEETING

Held at United Nations Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 3 May 1995 at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ERDÖS (Hungary)

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF VARIOUS WORKING PAPERS ON ISSUES RELATING TO ARTICLE III OF THE TREATY

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference and Support Services, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of this meeting and of other meetings of the Conference will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the Conference.

95-80925 (E)



/...

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

CONSIDERATION OF VARIOUS WORKING PAPERS ON ISSUES RELATING TO ARTICLE III OF THE TREATY

1. The CHAIRMAN reviewed the work carried out and said that the Committee should decide on the final text of its report as speedily as possible. Of the five working papers under consideration, three had met with the approval of all delegations: the working paper on State systems of accounting and control (NPT/CONF.1995/MC.II/WP.3), the paper on the safeguards in nuclear-weapon States (NPT/CONF.1995/MC.II/WP.5) and the paper on the financing of safeguards (NPT/CONF.1995/MC.II/WP.4). Only two working papers were still pending, namely the papers on plutonium and physical protection. He suggested that the Committee should first of all resume consideration of the working paper on plutonium (NPT/CONF.1995/MC.II/WP.9), focusing on the proposal put forward by the Islamic Republic of Iran.

2. Mr. BAEIDINESAD (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that following consultations and in order to facilitate the discussion, it had been decided to shorten the text of the paragraph initially proposed to two lines only: "The Conference endorses further work of IAEA on improving the safeguards arrangements for large-scale commercial reprocessing facilities." That sentence could constitute the third sentence of paragraph 1 of the working paper.

3. Mr. AGRELL (United Kingdom) noted with satisfaction that the wording of the proposal by the Islamic Republic of Iran had thus been shortened. That proposal affirmed that and supported the purpose of the second sentence in paragraph 1. It was absolutely necessary to recognize the efforts made in recent years to improve the effectiveness of the Agency's safeguards relating to large-scale commercial reprocessing facilities and it would be desirable if the Islamic Republic of Iran agreed to certain amendments to the text, namely: replacing the word "further" with the word "continuing" and inserting the word "further" between the words "on" and "improving".

4. Mr. ISASHIKY (Japan) said that the text proposed by the Iranian delegation was not acceptable since the budget for IAEA activities could be approved only by the Agency itself and not the Conference. The Conference could not take decisions that would prejudice decisions to be taken by the Agency. For that reason, the word "further" did not seem appropriate. While the proposal by the United Kingdom was most certainly an improvement, it would be better to delete that adjective.

5. Mr. BAEIDINESAD (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that he supported the comments made by the previous speakers. The proposal by the representative of the United Kingdom was acceptable and should allay the concerns expressed by Japan since it merely referred to the continuation of the work of IAEA. The Iranian delegation was prepared to accept the amendments proposed by the United Kingdom.

6. Mr. WALKER (Australia) said that he supported the text as amended by the representative of the United Kingdom and felt that it took account of the concerns expressed by Japan.

7. Mr. SAINT-MIEUX (France) said that, while he supported the substance of the Iranian proposal since France was also in favour of improving the safeguards system, particularly with regard to reprocessing facilities, he felt that the wording was somewhat blunt. The word "improving" implied that the current safeguards for reprocessing plants were not very good. As indicated by the representative of the United Kingdom, there was a need therefore to recognize the fact that the work carried out to date had been very satisfactory, although it was desirable to improve it further.

8. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should adopt the new wording of the proposal submitted by the Islamic Republic of Iran as amended by the United Kingdom and include it as the third sentence of paragraph 1 of the working paper.

9. It was so decided.

10. Mr. WALKER (Australia) said that consultations had been held by several delegations on certain points in the working paper on plutonium which were still controversial. The text that had resulted from the consultations, however, had not yet been finalized. The delegations concerned would meet as a working group that afternoon in order to reach agreement on the final wording to be adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN'S WORKING PAPER ON IAEA SAFEGUARDS

11. The CHAIRMAN suggested turning to consideration of paragraphs 14.a.1 and 14.a.2 of the working paper on IAEA safeguards which he had submitted to the Committee and had already been discussed in great detail, with two versions on one issue and some differences as to wording. The question of the Agency as the sole responsible body had also arisen. He felt that the differences with regard to wording could be resolved in order to be able to submit a consensus text on IAEA. It should be recalled that, following consultations with his colleagues in Vienna, the IAEA representative in New York felt that the wording to the effect that the Agency was the sole responsible body for applying the safeguards was completely valid legally.

12. Since it had not been possible to reach agreement on the wording of the paragraphs under consideration or on the amendments proposed by certain delegations, he urged the members of the Committee to meet as a working group in order to draw up a text that could be adopted by consensus.

PHYSICAL PROTECTION (NPT/CONF.1995/MC.II/WP.8 and revised version)

13. The CHAIRMAN requested the members of the Committee to express their views on the paper on physical protection in order to adopt a definitive text.

14. Mr. HOUCK (United States of America) referring to paragraph 2, said that the Russian Federation had proposed adding the word "unirradiated" before the phrase "nuclear material".

15. Mr. SCHMIDT (Austria) said that, in paragraph 1, unlike paragraph 2, the words "nuclear material" should be used instead of "unirradiated direct-use materials".

16. Mr. ROSU (Romania) proposed that the phrase "and prevention of illicit trafficking" should be inserted after the words "in physical protection" in the last sentence of paragraph 1.

17. Mr. BLANKENSTEIN (Germany) welcomed the changes that had been made in the paper on physical protection following the consultations. He supported the proposals made by the representatives of Austria and Romania because illicit trafficking had become a growing concern. Referring to paragraph 3, he proposed that the words "or minimize" should be inserted after the word "avoid", as had already been proposed by the delegation of Greece.

18. Mr. SCHMIDT (Austria) said that he supported the proposal by the representative of Germany with regard to paragraph 3.

19. Mr. MACERO (Mexico) said that he also supported the proposals by the representatives of Austria and Romania.

20. The CHAIRMAN concluded the discussion on the working paper on physical protection, pointing out that four amendments to the text had already been adopted: two relating to paragraph 1, one concerning paragraph 2 and another regarding paragraph 3.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.